



Trans-Lake Washington Project

Washington State
Department of Transportation
Sound Transit

**Public Input For Weeks of
March 22 to April 6, 2001**

Source: E-mail

Date of Comment: March 22, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and impacts.

Comment: Raise the driving age to 18... we pay taxes for school buses; why should we subsidize, in terms of every 16 year old's desire to drive, the excess pressure on our transportation systems, not to mention emissions. Not to mention, they are the most dangerous drivers on the road.

Source: E-mail

Date of Comment: March 22, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, general-purpose lane/s, transit, and TDM.

Comment: Two ideas: 1) Give companies financial incentives to encourage telecommuting. 2) Limit access to the freeway for single passenger cars during rush hour to those people who have lived here the longest.

Since all of the on-ramps have traffic lights on them why not combine that with limits to who can drive when. Basically limit the freeway during part of the peak rush hour to people who have lived here over 10 years. People less than five years can't drive during one hour of rush hour unless they pay a small fee that will be mailed to them. Use a camera on the on-ramp to get their license and bill them. They already use bar codes on the express lanes in California so this is very easy to do. People who have lived here less than two years can't drive during rush hour without a larger fee to encourage them to pay for the transportation they are requiring. I realize that people will be upset or cheat, but the people who paid for the roads should be allowed to use them first and companies should be required to pay for the increased cost of congestion if they want to build in areas that don't have the means to get their workers to work. Just as an aside, most women don't want mass transit. It's not safe for us to ride at night and it rarely makes the cross town trips we need.

Source: Project Dialogue Center

Date of Comment: March 23, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, and interchanges.

Comment: Name is Richard Asia and is strongly against the SR 520 tunnel and I-5 over-ramp. Lives in the Eastlake area and have lived there for 25 years. Will fight it desperately.

Source: E-mail

Date of Comment: March 26, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, project, and tunnel.

Comment: I recently reviewed the article in the Madison Park Times regarding the Trans-Lake project. It mentions the intention of building a tunnel under MadisonPark/Madronna. I have read lots of correspondence from the Trans-Lake Project and never once do I remember that as a alternative nor allusion to that in any previous articles. Please let it be known to you that everyone I know in this community and I will fight you vigorously if you have any plans to disrupt our neighborhood further with such a horrendous assault on the quality of our and our children's lives. We already bear the brunt of much of the Trans-Lake traffic problems. Also my family and I would like to know why no one from our communities is on the executive committee? Why were the committees realigned in such a manner? With much trepidation, [names]

Source: Mail

Date of Comment: March 23, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, transit, mitigations/enhancements, bike/pedestrian lane, and TDM.

Comment: While reviewing the various plans for the SR 520 bridge it occurred to me that there is a much cheaper solution (and speedier):

Use the money to double the bus service and make more lanes bus only...

- i. Then middle of the I-90 bridge should be buss only (or rubber wheel rail)
- ii. Faster busses means that more trips can be made per bus... saving money.
- iii. Mercer Island needs to have more frequent bus service and perhaps the xx people who live there require nicer bus stops to encourage them.
- iv. There ought to be a program wherein residents can easily get permits and perhaps building materials to design and build nice buss stops!
- v. The 520 bridge should eventually have two of its four lanes converted to bus only.
- vi. It has been demonstrated in cities all over the world that more lanes only bring more traffic and discourage bus usage. Furthermore more lanes will encourage more sprawl.
- vii. Seattle has become very polluted in just the past ten years!!! The future is not with more SOVs... The U district and downtown are already over flooded with traffic from 520 and 90... If cars come off of those bridges in greater floods the city streets and residential areas will become even more clogged with commuters.
- viii. A light weight wooden bridge for bikes could be attached to the south side of the bridge. Cheap and fast.

Thanks- [signature]

Source: Mail

Date of Comment: April 5, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, transit, north bridge, ferry, and TDM.

Comment: Dear Sir/Madam:

Your writer, a retired CPA, attended the March 6, 2001, open house at the Museum of History and Industry in Seattle, also have read the comments published regarding the rush hour crossing of Lake Washington. A number of the alternatives being considered seem to have some validity, though an additional bridge between SR 520 and I-90 is NOT wanted, nor one north of SR 520.

Your writer became an avid bus rider in the 1973/74 gas shortage. My viewpoint is traffic congestion should be alleviated by moving people, not vehicles. Roadway congestion may be impossible to relieve; however, moving people other than roadway will provide relief to those using such an alternative.

Passenger vessels may be an answer, they substituting bus travel. The recent study of the Kirkland-U of WA passenger vessel was totally impractical in recommending catamaran vessels of 49 and/or 149 capacity with three crew members on each, this too high a labor application for such capacities.

A visit to the U.S. Coast Guard gives the manning requirements for Small Passenger Vessels (SPV) (Under 100 GT). The crew reduction is made by maintaining one passenger level. The enclosed sheets give the regulations, also some nautical terminology.

Please obtain some passenger vessel potential, this requiring naval architects. Simple type vessels should be capable of direct across Lake WA routes, the Kirkland-U of WA route being some four miles of open lake and about two miles of 7 knot speed from the U of WA to higher speed area.

Yours very truly, [signature]

[inserted nautical and Small Passenger Vessel information- 3 pages]

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Project

Comment: Dear Trans-Lake Washington Project, My birthday is March 6, 2001. You know the bus #3358 East to Mercer Island Bellevue. I was born March 6, 1958 Providence Hospital, Seattle Washington. If you thought getting to the moon was tough try crossing Lake Washington during rush hour. As you know, I am a temp Labor Ready, 6 years and I travel all over Washington on Job Assignments. I help build saddle back park Newport, Bellevue and worked on buildings in Mercer Island and Bellevue. I feel proud to be able to travel the State of Washington and construct the Emerald City. I feel proud with emotional feelings to represent my Asian brothers and sisters and all my friends of my generation age group to help build and construct the Emerald City. Love, [name]

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, early action, general-purpose lane/s, and HCT.

Comment: Traffic is bad 14 hours a day. Quit talking about it and start doing something! Increase SR 520 to three lanes each way – add another bridge with both vehicle and light rail capacity with tracks extending to Redmond and Issaquah – and stop wasting money studying the obvious! (Thanks for reading this).

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, and interchanges.

Comment: How can you even propose an expanded SR 520 through Foster Island to feed into an already full I-5? More noise and more vehicles are not good for densely settled Seattle.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, general-purpose lane/s, HOV lane/s, and HCT.

Comment: Our Preferences: 1) Add one general purpose and one HOV lane in each direction, and 2) Add HCT in a mid-lake corridor.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and HCT.

Comment: I'd like to see HCT (like a monorail, people-mover, or the like) across SR 520. Vancouver has an effective system linked to elevated rail, which we could emulate (though it looks like the light rail project may be changed or scrapped, and the two should be compatible).

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, mitigations/enhancements, ferry, transit, HCT, and TDM.

Comment: What happened to the idea of re-instituting a ferry boat across Lake Washington? This would do the most good by getting some people out of their cars entirely. It would need good bus or train connections onshore at each side of the lake.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, HCT, and TDM.

Comment: Why has no consideration been given to an elevated high-speed monorail system along the freeway and I-90/520 corridors? It's cost-effective and would get people out of their cars.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Project and public involvement.

Comment: Suggest the funds that are being spent at the printers, be spent on the road. What is the end game on this PR job? Is the Sno-job, Sound Transit?

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, HOV lane/s, and TDM.

Comment: No additional lanes on SR 520 – use two existing lanes for HOV. No re-striping of I-90 for increased SOV capacity. No increased traffic on neighborhood streets. I agree with the values of “Westside of Lake WA”

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, bike/pedestrian lane/s, and TDM.

Comment: Add a bike lane to the current bridge. 1) We don't need any more cars in the city. 2) Whatever lanes one builds, people will fill – then find an alternative once traffic is sufficiently congested. 3) We need exercise – the country is too sedentary.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, mitigations/enhancements, transit, HCT, and TDM.

Comment: We need a light rail, subway, something that will separate commuters and encourage use of transit system. Also, a separate lane for small cars – let SUVs be in a lane with large vehicles so they are not endangering the smaller cars that can no longer see around, past them. They are dangerous. We need to get people out of big gas hog cars and into a sane transport system. Underwater subway. Cars are a problem in general.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, early action, transit, and TDM.

Comment: It's crucial to get transit started. Sooner or later we will have to do it. Let's discourage this prevalent denial syndrome and just face facts and plan for the long-term. We need to be weaned from cars and cheap gas – just compare with the rest of the world!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, early action, HCT, right-of-way, and TDM.

Comment: My family and I recently moved to Tacoma in small part because of the congestion in and around Seattle. My great hope is that “High Capacity Transit” if that means rail, will increase in frequency of available trips, and decrease in terms of relative cost. I think rail on existing highway and rail right of way is the best solution.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Impacts and mitigations/enhancements.

Comment: The neighborhoods next to the freeway have to go (Montlake, Hunts Point, etc). Let’s get on with it and allow high rises to compensate the property owners.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, general-purpose lane/s, and HOV lane/s.

Comment: Believe we need to add one general purpose and one HOV lane in each direction.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, transit, and HCT.

Comment: Maintain the current four lanes for auto use. Add completely separate lanes each way for bus or rail expresses. Additional auto lanes will add more congestion to I-5 and Montlake Boulevard, which are unlikely to be widened.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, tolls/tax, project, transit, and HCT.

Comment: I’m skeptical after seeing past projects like this end without a solution due to NIMBY rhetoric. I’d like balanced solutions – more standard traffic volume, transit other than buses. Install tolls to reduce volumes during peak periods.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, project, tolls/tax, and TDM.

Comment: Turn it over to a private operation who will pay for it through tolls and guarantee to build six lanes in each direction with a span for large boats (i.e., no draw bridge).

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, tolls/tax, HOV lane/s, and general-purpose lane/s.

Comment: I would suggest that if you go to tolls, but HOV lanes be free and that a toll will be for GP lanes. This is for SR 520.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and HCT.

Comment: Add HCT in the SR520 corridor.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives

Comment: Support "Take no action" alternative.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and TDM.

Comment: The best thing to do is to DO NOTHING. The lesson of history is that creating extra channels leads quickly to new developments and the spiral continues. Let the population adapt to the present capacity. Increasing carrying capacity does not solve the problem; it exacerbates it.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, HOV lane/s, general-purpose lane/s, HCT, and early action.

Comment: Add a minimum of two lanes in each direction; one HOV and one regular. Include ability to add train/monorail in future. Let's build some capacity – SOON!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, HOV lane/s, general-purpose lane/s, HCT, and early action.

Comment: I would like to see one general purpose and one HOV lane added in each direction on SR 520. Most of our travels are to destinations not conveniently served by mass transit. While maintaining neighborhoods are valuable, the need for more efficient transportation for many outweighs the desires of the few. Tough choices, but let's get going!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, mitigations/enhancements, toll/tax, and transit.

Comment: A toll needs to be placed on the 520 and I-90 bridges, and perhaps on 405 and I-5, for all SOVs. Their toll needs to be higher than the cost of riding the bus. Currently, I pay \$3.50 a day to ride Bus #550 from downtown Bellevue to the King County Administration Building to work. SOVs should pay \$5.00/day.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, transit, HOV lane/s, HCT, I-90, and TDM.

Comment: I can't speak for League of Women Voters but as for myself I hope we emphasize reducing SOV traffic. I like the idea of a bus/vanpool only lane in each direction (we need more vans as the demand is so great). It would make sense to have High Capacity Transit in I-90 – it was designed for it.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and bicycle/pedestrian lane.

Comment: I'd like to have another bicycle lane across Lake Washington – on the SR 520 bridge or another.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, mitigations/enhancements, transit, and HCT.

Comment: I feel a minimum footprint approach maintaining SR 520 as four lanes should be taken while ringing Lake Washington with High Capacity Transit (monorail or light rail) and feeding it with local buses to take vehicle traffic off the I-90 and SR 520 bridges (while improving the SR 520 bridge).

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and HCT.

Comment: It is time for commuters to get out of their cars and learn to ride HCT. The alternative chosen should lend itself to economic expansion of capacity when what is done next reaches exhaustion.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, HOV lane/s, general-purpose lane/s, and TDM.

Comment: To address the traffic problem will clearly require using multiple approaches including demand-management and land-use strategies. But to replace the existing bridge without adding one general purpose and one HOV lane in each direction (plus a bike lane) seems very shortsighted. Anything less than four lanes in each direction won't even address the current traffic volumes, let alone allow for future increases.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, project, toll/tax, HOV lane/s, general-purpose lane/s, and TDM.

Comment: 1) Add one general purpose and one HOV lane in each direction to the Evergreen Point Bridge. 2) Make this bridge a toll bridge to pay the cost as well as to discourage usage. (Above alternative existed and superior. No more time should be spent to study other alternatives).

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and bicycle/pedestrian lane.

Comment: I'm a carpenter. I commute to my jobs by bicycle. For four months I rode from my home in the Rainier Valley to Kirkland. I want bicycle access to the Evergreen Point Bridge.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Impacts, mitigations/enhancements, and project.

Comment: Montlake Interchange congestion clogs N-S movement between the Seattle neighborhoods on either side of cut/ SR 520. How is the Trans-Lake Project addressing such "indirect" impacts of SR 520 congestion? My family and I make N-S trips (e.g. Capitol Hill to Wedgwood) daily, and the congestion cause by the Montlake interchange affects us significantly.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and impacts.

Comment: Protect our neighborhoods. More traffic with newest technology. Use something other than more roads.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Project

Comment: Show me the money!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, mitigations/enhancements, transit, HOV lane/s, I-90, and HCT.

Comment: Bus transport – from the Eastside. 1) Metro rail system from UW to airport – does nothing for Eastside. 2) “Park and Rides” – we need many more places to park. Many live too far from bus routes to walk to bus stops. 3) Keep I-90 reverse lane open for Mercer Island residents. 4) Configure lanes to accommodate buses so they are always in HOV lanes.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, HOV lane/s, and general-purpose lane/s.

Comment: The best alternative that will make biggest impact on gridlock is to add one general purpose and one HOV lane in each direction. All others fail to make any difference. The idea of a freeway with only two lanes with an HOV lane is a “proven failure” like I-405 in Renton. More SOV lanes please!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and early action.

Comment: It is time to face up to hard choices and to get action started. A wider SR 520 is one obvious need, which services current transportation patterns. It is probably the least expensive alternative when considering connecting roads. People will be unhappy – but it has to be done.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Mitigations/enhancements, entrance lanes, and interchanges.

Comment: It would be in our long-term best interest to 1a) Make exit from I-5 to SR 520 right lane, 1b) Make entrance to I-5 from SR 520 Right lane, 2) Widen SR 520 by two lanes each way, 3) Buy up property below Inverness and along the SR 520 corridor and make it a park.

Source: Mail (brochure)
Date of Comment: April 4, 2001
Subjects: Alternatives and bicycle/pedestrian lane.
Comment: Bicycles should be able to use any new bridge/tunnel/etc.

Source: Mail (brochure)
Date of Comment: April 4, 2001
Subjects: Alternatives and HCT.
Comment: We need a light rail system to cross the lake with.

Source: Mail (brochure)
Date of Comment: April 4, 2001
Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, mitigations/enhancements, entrance lanes, interchanges, and lids.
Comment: Flyovers that eliminate housing on Boylston Ave E. are unacceptable to the Eastlake neighborhood!!! Noise on Ship Canal Bridge must be mitigated as part of project. Lids across from Seward school are essential. The Portage Bay Bridge ought to be both quiet and beautiful!!!

Source: Mail (brochure)
Date of Comment: April 4, 2001
Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, transit, HCT, and TDM.
Comment: Building for more cars = more noise, pollution, ill health & fractured communities – and contributing to global warming. SR 520 should remain four lanes only, with buses and high occupancy vehicles given preference. In WW2 a slogan was, “If you drive alone, you drive with Hitler.” Today’s slogan must show people that driving alone harms the environment and clogs our roads. Please don’t widen SR 520. Thanks.

Source: Mail (brochure)
Date of Comment: April 4, 2001
Subjects: Alternatives, HOV lane/s, transit, and HCT.
Comment: Take the “minimum footprint” alternative of maintaining SR 520 as four lanes with HOV improvements – convert one lane in each direction to HOV/bus – and expand Link light-rail (HCT) to the SR 520 corridor.

Source: Mail (brochure)
Date of Comment: April 4, 2001
Subjects: Project

Comment: Its time you acted as a Department of Transportation and not a Department of Highways. Highways never solve a people-moving problem.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, and mitigations/enhancements.

Comment: A comprehensive solution needs to consider how to reduce Montlake Bridge congestion. It can take 45 minutes to go ½ mile.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, north bridge, ferry, and HCT.

Comment: As a resident of Sand Point neighborhood I do not want a bridge/ferry/train etc built in my area.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, general-purpose lane/s, HOV lane/s, north bridge, and TDM.

Comment: Studies have shown that increased highway capacity encourages increased traffic eventually developing into gridlock. We need to encourage behavior changes: no more general-purpose lanes – HOV in each direction only. The third lake crossing should be in the North lake area, which is generating so much of the activity.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, mitigations/enhancements, I-90, general-purpose lane/s, and HOV lane/s.

Comment: I-405, I-5, I-90, and SR 520 simply need two extra lanes added on in each direction. Please do not add HOV lanes. In fact eliminated HOV lanes would help solve some amount of congestion.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, general-purpose lane/s, and early action.

Comment: The only solution is to add more general-purpose lanes to SR 520 including the bridge, and it needs to be done ASAP.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, mitigations/enhancements, HOV lane/s, and lid/s.

Comment: 1) At a minimum add continuous one each way HOV lanes that will encourage transit lanes and carpooling. 2) Cover it in Montlake from 24th to Overpass to MOHAI – put park facilities similar to Mercer Island. 3) Improve flow of local traffic south on 24th.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and north bridge.

Comment: I favor a third bridge at Kirkland to Sand Point with new connection across the plateau east to I-90 and to the west to I-5.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, interchanges, and general-purpose lane/s.

Comment: The road from Redmond to north Seattle should be just that! It should be 3½ miles North of SR 520. SR 520 as it joins I-5 going south is an impossible-impossible road. Please get onto a map and locate Redmond as it relates to Seattle. You will see for yourself. SR 520 bridge needs replacement – widening, double deck... but still the bottleneck is getting on I-5 going south.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, tunnel, and HCT.

Comment: Extend SR 520 bridge to also carry light rail besides car traffic. Or have SR 520 bridge carry only light rail and move car traffic to a tunnel hanging under the bridge.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Impacts, transit, and HCT.

Comment: For Pete's sake, please don't set up another mess like the one you now have "going" with the Seattle subway & street car system!!!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, mitigations/enhancements, HCT, and bicycle/pedestrian lane.

Comment: I continue to support bike, walk, and transit alternatives. Any HCT should be built along I-90 and/or SR 520, not new site which would mean increased disruptions at either lake end. HCT should smoothly tie in with Sound Transit and Metro. Seems like both sides of the lake want quiet and wildlife/natural areas enhanced.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, transit, HCT, bicycle/pedestrian lane, right-of-way, and lid/s.

Comment: Emphasis needs to be on transit. Allow for future light rail service to Bellevue and Redmond. Design any new structure with designated R.O.W. for rail. Lid the freeway with public parks, allow for generous bike/pedestrian lanes that are protected from traffic.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: TDM

Comment: We are all aware that there is a transportation problem, however it seems to me that more emphasis should be concentrated on reducing the amount of traffic movement – Easy enough said than done, but Rome wasn't built in a day, either.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, general-purpose lane/s, HOV, HCT, I-90, and TDM.

Comment: I would like to see the following alternatives pursued: Adding high-capacity transit in the SR 520 corridor. Adding one general purpose & one HOV lane in each direction. Adding HCT in the I-90 corridor. Implementing strategies to reduce transportation demand. Implementing land use strategies. I would like to see all of the above alternatives pursued and implemented.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, HOV lane/s, and entrance ramps.

Comment: I would very much like to see an approach to HOV lanes as in California. Barriers between the HOV lane(s) in all locations EXCEPT at on/off ramps. Prevents people from using them illegally, and protects HOV drivers from merging traffic.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, general-purpose lane/s, HOV lane/s, mitigations/enhancement, and I-90.

Comment: I would make SR 520 similar to I-90: more lanes, straighter, flatter. An additional general purpose and HOV lane is necessary. I would put most of money here and a minimum on neighborhood enhancement. A wide bike lane would be nice.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, HOV lane/s, and toll/tax.

Comment: Do not increase lanes on SR 520. Dedicate one, each way to HOV, carpools, toll payers (i.e., H.O.T. lanes) Replace pontoons, etc. when necessary for proper maintenance. Increase mixed-use communities at both ends of SR 520, such that the bridge could be almost exclusively a HOV shuttle route across the lake by 2020.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, transit, bicycle/pedestrian lane, tunnel, and TDM.

Comment: I favor free buses and some other means to encourage people to get out of their cars. Why can't we have a bicycle lane attached to the outside of the floating bridge. In the long-term we may need a tunnel for transit, mid-lake.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: General-purpose lane/s and HOV lane/s.

Comment: Build at least two more six-lane bridges!!! Half measures won't work. Cut out HOV lanes and allow no new growth in this area. (I realize all suggestions are politically incorrect).

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, general-purpose lane/s, transit, HOV lane/s, HCT, and lid.

Comment: I agree with most of what has been said so far, but I think the people living next to 520 on both sides of the lake will have to put up with some noise unless an I-90 Mercer Island type lid is added – too expensive? My suggestions: Add one general purpose and one HOV lane in each direction. Trains are too expensive and inflexible – use buses, you can add more or change routes as demand changes.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, HOV lane/s, general-purpose lane/s, HCT, bicycle/pedestrian lane, toll/tax, and lid.

Comment: Add four lanes across the lake (existing bridge to one-HOV/three-all traffic – westbound, same configuration on New Bridge east) plus pedestrian/bicycle mini-lane and elevated, transit (monorail – preferably “Mag-Lev”) From East shore of Lake WA to Bellevue

(or I-405), double stack all lanes (2 layers, like Alaskan Way Viaduct) & lid the whole thing (like W. Mercer Island). Raise the gas tax (by \$1.00/gal) to pay for it all.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Ferry

Comment: Let's get with it! The only way is two hundred ferry boat from Madison to Kirkland. I was six years old when Capt Anderson had the black ball ferry. Let's sail again! Why not, let's go fishing.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Transit, bicycle/pedestrian lane, and lid.

Comment: We need more public transit. [Use] single occupancy lanes. Incorporate bikes, pedestrians, lid the interchanges. Please.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, transit, bicycle/pedestrian lane, and HCT.

Comment: This is pointless without major transit improvements. It NEEDS to include bike lanes, bus lanes, sidewalks that are ADA compliant, potential (room) for trains – otherwise it will just become a bigger parking lot, not justifying the money and habitat destruction.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Transit and bicycle/pedestrian lane.

Comment: We need to plan better – have some type of vision, so that we won't have problems (duh). More public transit – fewer single occupancy travel lanes. Transit only lanes. Bike/pedestrian passage.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: HOV lane, HCT, bicycle/pedestrian lane, and lid.

Comment: The #1 priority should be expanding our transportation choices. 1) Plan for light rail to Eastside. 2) Biking/walking/HOV lanes instead of single occupancy lanes. LID THE FREEWAY!!!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Transit, HOV lane/s, bicycle/pedestrian lane, lid, and right-of-way.

Comment: Don't just add a lane. Increase transit. Add HOV for whole bridge. Put a lid on it (green up the bridge). Add a bike lane. Exclusive right-of-way dedicated to transit. Be visionary – plan for 100 years, not 10 or 20. Create a pedestrian friendly atmosphere.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: HOV lane/s and TDM.

Comment: Until you can figure out a way to get more than one person per car I don't see any need for a bridge! I see or hear nothing about carpooling.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Impacts and HCT.

Comment: I am opposed to adding any type of high capacity transit in a mid-lake corridor (between SR520 and I-90). That would be devastating to locate HCT through residential areas.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Impacts, mitigations/enhancements, and HCT.

Comment: Protecting neighborhoods should be primary. Secondary is to move people and goods using the latest technology (updated monorail-type – “urbanot”?) with the least impact to the environment. More roads are NOT the answer.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, HOV lane/s, HCT, and toll/tax.

Comment: As stated previously, 1) Do SR 522 1st, around North of Lake, 2) Redo 520 – 3 lanes each way – no HOV, no rail, 3) No new taxes either!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Impacts, interchanges, and entrance lanes.

Comment: Do something about the “bottlenecks” that cause the back ups. The U-District at I-5 for example. People crossing all the lanes to get to SR 520. People crossing all the lanes to get to downtown. How about some off-ramps?

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, general-purpose lane/s, and early action.

Comment: This is taking much too long. You're not going to satisfy everyone. Focus on solving the problem by creating more capacity at any cost, as fast as possible. It takes me far more than 31 minutes from Redmond – Seattle – 50-90 min. Acknowledge the truth – SOV will always be needed so be realistic, provide more lanes.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, transit, and entrance lanes.

Comment: Please work to reduce commute times by public transit, rather than worrying about cars. This way there's a desirable alternative for those who are willing to be part of the solution by riding transit. This simply involves dedicating lanes and ramps on SR 520 to transit. The 3-passenger carpool backs up, slowing down buses.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Tunnel and HCT.

Comment: A floating tunnel seems ultra risky and expensive. It seems most logical that SR 520 should be rebuilt to accommodate HCT since it already needs to be rebuilt.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, HOV lane/s, bicycle/pedestrian lane, HCT, and I-90.

Comment: Add HOV/transit lane. Add bicycle/pedestrian lane. HCT in future – transition HOV lane. HCT on I-90 first.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Tunnel, north bridge, toll/tax, and HCT.

Comment: We need to step up and spend the money to tunnel under the U-district to Sand Point, build another bridge from Sand Point to Kirkland to reroute northwest traffic to northeast destinations. Too many are using SR 520 to go northeast. Make SR 520 a toll for SOV and light rail only – one article in the Times said “The points don't want a third bridge” – is that where the owner of the Times lives? Other big cities have tunnels and bridges, so can we. (“No name please, too many friends in sensitive areas. Thanks!”)

Source: Mail (brochure)

Comment Number: TL 282

Subjects: North Bridge

Comment: Fixing the SR 520 corridor will not begin to fix even today's problem let alone the future. Stop kidding yourselves and the public. You will need a third and even a fourth bridge, freeway north of Lake Washington, etc.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, tunnel, and public involvement.

Comment: Widen SR 520 \$/or add a parallel floater. Don't go underwater. Opening the bridge six times/year is no big deal. Evaluate free bus service during peak rush hours. Don't overlook Walter Narene's reminder that earthquakes can be a problem for construction. When you refer to a page number, number the pages, especially in a fold-out.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: General-purpose lane/s and project.

Comment: General traffic lanes are more effective than HOV lanes. Select consulting firms not by size or how much they contribute to "causes" but according to past records in other urban areas. Eliminate firms with continual records of imposing design/construction overruns.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Project

Comment: As experts in the field, you should know by now that band-aids do not last. The same happened to I-405 as with I-5 downtown. You need to expand SR 520 to provide for the growth, which you cannot stifle, for the next 30 years.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Mitigation, project, and public-involvement.

Comment: I'm starting to get a little pissed off. I've gotten mailing after mailing, attended "workshop" after "workshop" and my neighborhood's OVERWHELMINGLY LOUD opinion has been that we want WASHDot to get some credibility, to get down solid promises that our 40 years of Noise-hell will be mitigated. Instead, I just hear consultant-speak. Talk real. If you plan to screw us once again, just try, don't talk. I'm sick of talk.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Mitigations/enhancements, lid, transit, and entrance lanes.

Comment: Reduce noise, air, and water pollution. Lid SR520 through neighborhoods. Increase mass transit – reduce single occupancy. Reduce SR520 congestion at neighborhood access.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Impact, general-purpose lane/s, and TDM.

Comment: Building more roadways attracts more cars. The most important objective should be to keep traffic moving so solutions should include more tow trucks on the bridge. NO MORE ROADWAY.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, Early Action, I-90, and HCT.

Comment: 1) Take a “minimum footprint” approach – maintain SR 520 as four lanes. 2) Add HCT in the I-90 corridor. 3) Drop – HCT in a mid-lake corridor (between SR 520 & I-90). 4) Make early actions (for SR 520) happen – surface water management system for polluted bridge/surface road run-off.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, general-purpose lane/s, HOV lane/s, HCT, and TDM.

Comment: Response card: The more I think about the transportation problems and then read this booklet the more I realize our traffic problems will never be fixed because this group, plus the many others that have been formed over the years, will NOT even mention let alone address the problem of getting the SOVs off the road, in a serious way. Words will not do it but until we recognize and say, out loud, we must get out of our SOVs for commuting purposes – well forget it. The words on these pages have been written a hundred times, are old hat and useless as far as solving our transportation mess. Save the paper – save the words!!

Comments within the mailer: On list of What We’ve Heard So Far, West side of Lake Washington, “Why is ‘reduce the demand for single-occupancy cars’ at the bottom of the list? It should be at the top.” On page listing ‘What alternatives are being considered?’ she added yes/no to the following:

Yes – ‘Take a minimum footprint approach....’

Yes – ‘Add one HOV lane in each direction.’

No – ‘Add one general purpose and one HOV lane in each direction.’

Yes – ‘Add one bus/vanpool-only lane in each direction.’

Yes – ‘Add HCT in the SR 520 corridor.’

Yes – ‘Implement strategies to reduce transportation demand.’

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Project and public-involvement.

Comment: [Entire pamphlet mailed back] Comment card response: How much taxpayer \$\$ did you waste on this pamphlet? FIX THE PROBLEM! CUT THE EXPENSIVE OVERHEAD! On the front cover the person wrote “Duh” in response to ‘If you thought getting to the moon was tough, try crossing Lake Washington during rush hour’ and scrawled “WASTE OF TAXPAYER \$\$” across the front, and wrote ‘This is the problem’ across the picture of traffic. Taxpayers

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Project

Comment: [Entire pamphlet mailed back] “WASTED TAXPAYER \$\$” was written on the front and back.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, HCT, and bicycle/pedestrian lane.

Comment: Need to add HCT in 520 corridor
Need multi-use pedestrian/bike cross on 520 corridor including bridge.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: HCT and tunnel

Comment: I drive to Bellevue from South Seattle once each week to take my elderly and disabled mother to doctor’s appointments and shopping. I am not going to take the bus for that purpose. We need another bridge or a tunnel across the lake!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, bicycle/pedestrian lane, tunnel, toll/tax, and general-purpose lane/s.

Comment: I am very concerned that the alternatives listed do not include providing Bike/Pedestrian access across the lake. This must be included! Forget T\unnels- whatever floating or otherwise- too damn expensive. Let’s get on with building a facility- time is running out on existing bridge. Finance with tolls- set to reduce volume of SOV.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Impacts, transit, ferry, and tunnel.

Comment: Please!-emphasize buses, perhaps free ones. Each bus can replace 50 or more SOVs. This would be a relatively quick and easy answer to congestion. Investigate the possibility of several bus routes crossing the lake via bus ferries. Also: Maintain the existing bridge and scrap the glamorous new bridge and tunnels that must make engineers drool. WE DON'T NEED MORE ACCOMODATIONS FOR CARS!!!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, HOV lane/s, bicycle/pedestrian lane, HCT, and tunnel.

Comment: Add HCT and HOV lane in each direction on SR 520. Also add bicycle/pedestrian lane. Dig tunnel through eastside of SR 520 in Medina/Hunts Point to accommodate the extra lanes.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Bicycle/pedestrian lane, HCT, and I-90.

Comment: High capacity transit such as light rail should be provided across both SR 520 and I-90. The width of bike/pedestrian path across I-90 must be preserved. Add bike/pedestrian path across SR 520.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, general-purpose lane/s, HCT, and I-90.

Comment: First, thanks for the chance to comment! We support the "minimum footprint" approach, as well as developing HCT (a rail system or the like) either on SR 520 corridor, or/and somewhere as useful (I-90 or a new route). NO new car lanes- that will only add to the problem. Get people (especially SAOV in SUV) out of their polluting cars!!!!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Impacts

Comment: I live on the corner of 11 east and east Shelby. I would like to tell you that we hear all the noise from 520. It is really loud at night and early morning. In the same time it is still very noisy, but there are other noises also. I am very concerned of the air pollution from the addition traffic use. Also more congestion. I don't want SR 520 expanded.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Transit, HCT, toll/tax, and tunnel.

Comment: Bonds, taxes whatever it takes. Build a tunnel and provide links to Sound Transit and/or Monorail. We are already decades behind!!!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, public involvement, transit, lid, and toll/tax.

Comment: How much did this dreadful brochure cost? 1. Nobody wants to use mass transit. 2. Just build a double-deck bridge, throw a lid over the freeway in the points communities and call it a park. 3. Pay to access, points communities on/off ramps for nonresidents.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Tunnel

Comment: The floating tunnel at mid-lake is of great concern to me. I think the project team should drop this idea and concentrate on the existing corridors.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Mitigations/enhancements and HCT.

Comment: Be sure to make proper parking and stations connections for the monorails traveling both I-5 and I-405, and crossing with the Monorails serving SR 520 and I-90.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives

Comment: I remember reading about a new crossing and how it greatly improved the congestion. What happened? -What you propose is not doing anything for congestion to try and shove all the cars across SR 520 won't work. What next.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Impacts and transit

Comment: You are overlooking a virtually congestion free route which has always been there—the water! Building parking infrastructures and setting up shuttle buses would be far easier and cheaper than a new floating bridge.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Entrance lanes, bicycle/pedestrian lane, and I-90.

Comment: Bike lanes should be build larger and should permit use of battery operated mini care or motorbikes. 9-10 feet wide would be best. Still need an exit off westbound I-90 at 23rd Avenue, in Mt. Baker. Truly inconvenient to go all the way to Rainier.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Transit and HOV lane/s.

Comment: It is critical that better Public Transportation Access and Service be provided across the lake. As you must provide some parking to catch the transit. Add a HOV lane to SR 520.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Impacts and toll/tax.

Comment: Increase transit opportunities; OK to charge toll; be careful of Arboretum...impact.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: General-purpose lane/s.

Comment: Continue to allow Mercer Island residents in single occupancy vehicles to use the express car lanes during rush hour. I am a doctor and we need quick access to our patients.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, general-purpose lane/s, HOV lane/s, HCT, and I-90.

Comment: I favor adding a general-purpose lane and an HOV lane- THAT CONTINUES OVER THE BRIDGE- in each direction. HCT on 520 and/or I-90 would be a wonderful thing (look at London, Boston, NY, Paris, Chicago, even Cleveland) but I don't see the taxpayers willing to come to the plate on this one.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Transit, HOV lane/s, and I-90.

Comment: I think there should be HOV lanes in each direction on both I-90 and 520. Transit is the answer, not adding more capacity to people who insist on driving alone in their cars.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, HOV lane/s, bicycle/pedestrian lane, and tunnel

Comment: New bridge with HOV and bike lanes is an absolute necessity. Alternatives such as a tunnel should be considered.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, transit, and TDM.

Comment: Build large Park and Ride stations at each end of SR 520 and at each end of 148th Ave. NE in Bellevue. Run buses every 10 minutes from these stations. Then significantly reduce or eliminate employee parking at the large companies to encourage people to take the buses, as there would be only visitor parking spots at these companies.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Impacts and mitigations/enhancements.

Comment: There should be a law for each city, IF YOU WORK FOR THE CITY, YOU MUST LIVE IN THAT CITY. This would help the traffic problems.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: HCT

Comment: MONORAIL!!! WE VOTED FOR IT!!!!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, HOV lane/s, and TDM.

Comment: NO NEW BRIDGE. NO NEW ROAD. SPREAD OUT THE USAGE OVER TIME OF DAY. MORE HOV LANES EVERYWHERE.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and HOV lane/s.

Comment: Take into consideration future expansions outside of this phase. It needs to be possible to add lanes or transit at a later point. Also four lanes are not enough even at this point. Don't only think HOV lanes—hardly anybody uses them.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, general-purpose lane/s, and I-90.

Comment: Why does your most ambitious plan add only one general-purpose lane? Any one with common sense knows we need to add 2-3 lanes in each direction. Use I-90 as an excellent example to follow.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and transit.

Comment: I'd really like either parking by the Montlake bus stop or mini-bus service that would pick me up at home. Bainbridge Island had wonderful bus services to get people to the ferry, so I know that can be done. I know real estate is expensive in Montlake, but it would get so many people out of SOV's.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, impacts, and general-purpose lane/s.

Comment: Take a "minimum footprint" approach. Spend money on park and ride lots and transit improvements. Any "improvement" that increases SOV vehicle movement is self-defeating.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Transit, HOV lane/s, and tunnel.

Comment: RE: 520/Lake Washington Access travel: Go to "free bus" program – add 2 lanes, 1 each way for all cars, and add 2 more for bus, vans, HOV – a tunnel may work also.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Early action and HOV lane/s.

Comment: Instead of waiting until 2004 to implement any changes, why not make the eastbound entrances at Montlake and Lake WA. Blvd. carpool only (either two or three person). This would immediately diminish the backups on Montlake Blvd. and free up capacity on the bridge itself.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives, general-purpose lane/s, and HOV lane/s.

Comment: I suggest the following model: Just four lanes to be composed of two HOV lanes and two general-purpose lanes.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: General-purpose lane/s, HOV lane/s, and HCT.

Comment: Every effort should be made to add HCT in the mid-lake corridor. Also efforts should be focused on adding a general-purpose lane and HOV lane as well.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Project and ferry.

Comment: If ever a problem were talked to death, this topic would rank amongst the highest on the death list. While a “permanent” fix is being engineered, put ferries on the lake and run them! Let expert engineers decide the best bridge solution, give them one year – no more – and move on it! This may be one of those times when participatory democracy is out of place – so use some “benign” leadership and do it.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: HOV lane/s, toll/tax, and lids.

Comment: No HOV lanes. Tolls are OK. Build lids to reconnect neighborhoods.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Project, toll/tax, and ferry.

Comment: Reducing automobile use is important long term. That will only happen with an efficient integrated public transportation system. “What we’ve heard so far” sounds fine – “pie in the sky.” I’m tired of hearing politicians say we don’t have money to do things – get Bush to send us some of his trillion-dollar tax cut! Try a pass. Ferry from Madrona Dr. to Medina Civic Center.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Project, general-purpose lane/s, transit, and HCT.

Comment: This whole effort to make it easier for cars to come and go to and from Seattle is crazy. Make it hard (expensive) for cars and easy (cheap or free) for bus and monorail. [A \$50-

toll each way for any car with only the drier in it ought to help – you could knock off \$5- for each passenger in the car.]

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Mitigation, HOV lane/s, general-purpose lane/s, bicycle/pedestrian lane, and lid.

Comment: Add one general and one HOV in each direction. Maintain Trail N. sides SR 520 between Evergreen and Yarrow Points. Maintain current exits at Bellevue Way 92 and NE 84 NE. There is room for expansion. With minimal neighborhood disruption if designed right. Lids may be feasible in some locations if cost effective.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: HCT and tunnel.

Comment: This is the corridor which should have had the rail links and separate rail tunnel/bridge to encourage the reductions of cars similar to Vancouver B.C. to North Van. Build more lanes = more traffic. Look at I-5 now. This is “planning” in reverse, which is by definition faulty.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: General-purpose lane/s, HOV lane/s, HCT, bicycle/pedestrian lane, tunnel, right-of-way, and entrance lanes.

Comment: The most necessary corridor improvement is a bike/pedestrian (12') lane. No additional general-purpose lanes. HCT/HOV improvements only if no new ROW are needed in Seattle. A tunnel for Transit sounds good. Take down the ramps to no where.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Transit, HOV lane/s, entrance lanes, tunnel, and interchanges.

Comment: Multiple partial solutions are needed. Make the bottlenecks at each end of SR 520 better. Tunnel/high bridge Montlake cut, put to/from exits from I-5 on right side, direct link SR 520 to Mercer. Establish passenger ferries from several points on each side of lake, particularly Lake Union and UW. Eliminate car pool in favor of transit only.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: General-purpose lane/s

Comment: Please add additional general capacity across Lake Washington. Hundreds of thousands of people must use a private vehicle in their employment. We cannot use bus/HOV/transit options.

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: HOV lane/s and entrance lanes.

Comment: Add HOV lane in each direction. To be utilized by two persons. Increase highway to accommodate problems occurring from traffic backing up (Increase exit & entrance capabilities).

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Transit and I-90.

Comment: Add one-lane dedicated bus and vanpool in each direction on SR 520. Do the same on I-90 bridge. Then run a lot of buses. They'll fill up if you run them often (use Vancouver B.C. style buses= no schedules, run often).

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Impacts and project

Comment: SR 520 may be the best example of why our roads and congestion are in such terrible shape. Since we can't make a decision about how to build until everyone is happy-traffic worsens.. we pass 6 months... we fight new density and housing prices rise and the poor get poorer. Have the fortitude to make a decision and proceed. Our community needs more roads and the leadership to proceed!

Source: Mail (brochure)

Date of Comment: April 4, 2001

Subjects: Alternatives and HCT.

Comment: Two additional bridges for the price of none! The only ALTERNATIVE that fits within the infrastructure constraints (to/from the bridge) is a type of HCT that transports occupied cars. The Autobus looks like a conventional a-car transporter, but differs in that a patented mechanism allows a 20 second unload/load cycle. No new bridge (footprint) required. SOUND TRANSIT'S ATT study will reveal this in Spring 2001.
